APPENDIX III--*contd.*

MESSRS. S. SORAPPA and MARALE GOWDA (Sira Taluk) and CHOWDRI ABDUL RAZAK (Sira Municipality).—

*Q.—24.* Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) The amount sanctioned by Government for the year 1932-33 for the restoration and repairs of tanks in the State?

(*b*) The amount so far spent?

(*c*) The number of works in respect of which correspondence is being carried on between the Revenue and the Public Works Departments and what they are?

(*d*) The number of tanks since restored; the number of tank works under progress; the number of projects prepared and the estimated amount of expenditure?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—

| | | | Rs. |
|---|---|---|---|
| *A—24.* | (*a*) Restoration .... | .... | 7,23,000 |
| | Repairs .... | .... | 2,36,550 |
| | (*b*) Rs. 3,95,374 to the end of March 1933. | | |
| | (*c*) 90. *Vide* statement put up. | | (*Vide* Appendix.) |
| | (*d*) No. of tanks restored .... | .... | 80 |
| | No. of tank works in progress | .... | 1,165 |
| | No. of projects prepared | .... | 232 |
| | Estimate amount .... | | Rs. 22,97,736 |

MESSRS. A. NARAYANA IYENGAR (Hassan Taluk) and SIDDHANTHI SHAMA SHASTRY (Hassan Municipality).—

*Q.—26.* Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) The number of villages in which the land revenue arrears had not been recovered at the end of June 1932 in Hassan Taluk?

(*b*) The number of villages in which the kandayam, though not actually recovered, had been got written in the *khirdi*?

(*c*) The authority who got this entered, his name and his occupation?

(*d*) Whether the amounts got written in the above manner have actually been remitted to the treasury by the end of the month in which the amounts were got written?

(*e*) The reason for the amount being not remitted to the treasury and are there any rules in connection with this?

APPENDIX III—*contd.*

(*f*) Is there any Government order to the effect that such of the amounts as cannot be recovered should be brought on the *khirdi* by the Shanbhogues and Patels?

(*g*) Are there any villages in cases of which the amounts, though got entered into the *khirdis*, have not yet been remitted to treasury?

(*h*) Is it a fact that the Shanbhouge of Sanenahalli circle in Salagame Hobli of Hassan Taluk has petitioned the Revenue Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner of the district and the Sub-Division Officer, to the effect that the Amildar got entered into the *khirdis* such of the amounts of arrears of lands which had been resumed to Government, which had to be written off, and the arrears for which records had been built up?

(*i*) Has the Sub-Division Officer enquired into the matter and has he passed any orders thereon?

(*j*) Is it a fact that this Shanbhogue was suspended and, for the recovery of the amount that was got written in the *khirdi*, his lands were proceeded with?

(*k*) Has it come to the notice of the higher authorities that this Amildar has similarly dealt with many other Shanbhogues and Patels also?

(*l*) (i) What was the amount of land revenue arrears at the time of taking charge of the taluk by this Amildar?

(ii) What was the arrears relating to the previous years at the time of this Amildar's departure from this taluk, *i.e.*, at the end of January 1933?

(iii) The number of *kulas* in the case of whom the moveables especially the ploughing bullocks and hay stacks were distrained and the amount recovered and will not this procedure in these hard days harass the poor raiyats?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.—

*A.—26.* (*a*) 352 villages.

(*b*) There is nothing to show that there were any such instances.

(*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) Does not arise in view of answer to question (*b*).

(*f*) No.

(*g*) *Vide* answer to question (*b*).

(*h*) Yes.

(*i*) Yes. Final orders were passed on 4th May 1933 holding that the allegation had not been proved.

(*j*) The Shanbhogue was suspended in view of certain charges of misappropriation of kandayam by him. The sale of right, title and interest of the Shanbhogue in his lands was held for recovering the amounts which had been collected by him and which had not been credited to the treasury.

(*k*) No.

(*l*) (i) Rs. 78,355-12-0 at the end of October 1931 when he took charge.

(ii) Rs. 19,093-0-10.

(iii) The number of *kulas* in the case of whom moveables were attached cannot be readily ascertained. But, in most cases, the kandayam was recovered without selling the distrained property. It is not possible to say whether the bullocks distrained were ploughing bullocks.

It is a matter of opinion.

MESSRS. B. DAVAPPA GOWDA and B. K. SOME GOWDA (Manjarabad Taluk) and A. P. MALLESH GOWDA (Alur Sub-Taluk).—

*Q.—27.* Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) How long is it since the road running from Saklespur to Cheekanahalli *via* Arehalli was constructed ?

(*b*) Have some extents in the coffee numbers of Siragur Village in Arehalli Hobli of Belur Taluk been acquired for the purpose ?

(*c*) How long is it since the *hiduvali* coffee lands were acquired for the purpose and is it not the duty of the Government to remit the assessment on such of the portions as have been acquired ?

(*d*) For how many years past the assessment, which had to be remitted as per rules on these portions, has been recovered and, in case of such recovery will such kandayam be refunded to the respective land-holders ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.—

*A.—27.* (*a*) This information is not readily available.

(*b*) Yes, an extent of 3 acres and 13 guntas in Re-Servey No. 91 has been acquired.

(*c*) Information not readily available. The answer to the second part of the question is obvious.

(*d*) It is reported that full assessment was being recovered up to 1929-30, and that remission of proportionate